

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

) Confirmation No.: 1341
)
)
)
Appellant: LAWRENCE et al.
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
Application Serial No.: 09/825,470
)
)
)
Filing Date: April 2, 2001
)
)
)
For: AUTOMATED LEGAL ACTION
RISK MANAGEMENT
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
PTO Customer Number 28062
)
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
)
50 Locust Avenue
)
New Canaan, CT 06840
)
)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant hereby submits this paper in response to the Examiner's Answer,
mailed October 3, 2007.

Appellant generally stands on the arguments contained in the Appeal Brief. Appellant acknowledges the Examiner's Response to Arguments, section (10), of the Examiner's Answer. However, Appellant refutes certain aspects of the Examiner's Answer, including the Examiner's Response to Arguments, section (10), with respect to the characterization of Appellant's arguments.

Appellant further acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Regarding the Examiner's Answer and the Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter, Appellant respectfully submits that the previous citations to the Specification did in fact provide support for the claims. However, in a continuing effort to address remaining issues, Appellant further submits that paragraph [0029] and [0045] provide detailed support for the claimed aspects noted on page 2, paragraphs 1 – 3. Appellant also submits that paragraph [0044] of the Specification provides detailed support for the "receiving..." aspect of the claimed first discussed at page 3 of the Examiner's Answer.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6 – 9, 11 – 20, and 24 – 27 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as it relates to the alleged transitional phrase "consisting of", Appellant respectfully submits that the recited "consisting of" is not used as a transitional phrase. In particular, Appellant respectfully submits that a claim transition phrase provides a link between the preamble of the subject patent claim and the body of the subject claim. Appellant respectfully submits that the recited 'consisting of' does not serve as a link that provides a bridge (or transition) from the preamble of the claim to the remaining body of the claim. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reading and interpretation of the rejected claims is overly narrow and restrictive.

Regarding the other aspects of the Response to Argument, section (10) of the Examiner's Answer, not specifically addressed herein, Appellant relies on the arguments of record submitted in the Appeal Brief.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully suggest that rejections of claims 1 – 33 are improper and request that the rejections be reversed. The Honorable Board is respectfully urged to reverse the pending rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

December 03, 2007

Date

/Randolph P. Calhoune/

Randolph P. Calhoune
Registration No. 45, 371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985